REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 9-16 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter; rejects claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CHAN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,028) in view of HWANG et al. ("Graphic Algorithms to Identify Defects While Reusing Object-Oriented Software Components"); and rejects claims 5, 13, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over CHAN et al. in view of HWANG et al. and BAHRAMI (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078777). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.[1]

By way of the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 9, 17, and 22-28 to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9-16 and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter because claim 9 recites a memory and claim 22 recites a computer-readable memory device. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, Applicant amends claim 9 to recite a physical memory device and amends claim 22 to recite a physical computer-readable memory device. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-16 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

---

[1] As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicant's silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the final Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons for modifying a reference and/or combining references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on CHAN et al. and HWANG et al.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-25, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over CHAN et al. in view of HWANG et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method of integrating software systems. The method includes identifying, by a processor of the computer, the software systems that are to be integrated; identifying, by a processor of the computer, a scope of the integration based on a multi-level top-down approach; identifying, by the processor, business processes, associated with the software system, that are to be integrated; identifying, by the processor, business rules that are defined for each of the business processes that are to be integrated; identifying, by the processor, faults in the business rules by applying generic depth-first search (DFS)-based techniques to the business rules; and modifying, by the processor, the business rules based on the identified faults. CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more of these features.

For example, CHAN et al. and HWANG et al. do not disclose or suggest, identifying, by a processor, faults in business rules, that are defined for business processes to be integrated, by applying generic depth-first search (DFS)-based techniques to the business rules, as recited in amended claim 1. The Examiner admits that CHAN et al. does not disclose identifying, by a processor, faults in business rules that define software in the scope of the integration of software systems by applying generic depth-first search (DFS)-based techniques to the business rules, and modifying, by the processor, the business rules based on the identified faults and relies on the Rule Maintenance Toolkit for IDS of Fig. 2-1, the third paragraph of page 7, and the second

paragraph of page 21 (which describes the Rule Maintenance Toolkit for IDS of Fig. 2-1) of HWANG et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pp. 4-5 and 11). Applicant respectfully submits that HWANG et al. does not disclose the above features of amended claim 1.

At the third paragraph of page 7, HWANG et al. discloses that rule identifiers are used inside a Transition-Directed Graph (TDG) so that more information can be extracted when a fault pattern is found. This section of HWANG et al. further discloses that the depth-first search algorithmic pattern is used to develop algorithms used to detect chained-inference faults in an Information Distribution System (IDS) rules set of an IDS node. This section of HWANG et al. deals with using a depth-first search algorithmic pattern to <u>develop algorithms to detect faults</u> in an IDS rules set and does not disclose or suggest using depth-first search-based techniques to <u>identify faults in business rules that are defined for business processes to be integrated</u>. Therefore, this section of HWANG et al. does not disclose or suggest identifying, by a processor, faults in business rules, that are defined for business processes to be integrated, by applying generic depth-first search (DFS)-based techniques to the business rules, as recited in amended claim 1.

In the second paragraph of page 21, HWANG et al. discloses that the dynamic/execution corrector (DEC) in the error-removal module removes the dynamic/execution rule errors and optimizes the rule sets. This section of HWANG et al. does not disclose or suggest that the rules set defines business processes that are to be integrated. Therefore, this section of HWANG et al. does not disclose or suggest identifying, by a processor, faults in business rules, that are defined for business processes to be integrated, by applying generic depth-first search (DFS)-based techniques to the business rules, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by CHAN et al. and HWANG et al.

For example, claim 2 recites representing the business rules using a transition-directed graph (TDG) representation. The Examiner relies on page 38, lines 5-9 of HWANG et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 2 (Office Action, pp. 5-6 and 11). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of HWANG et al.

At page 38, lines 5-9, HWANG et al. discloses that, based on a Transition-Directed Graph (TDG), faults in IDS rule sets are defined as undesirable patterns appearing in an given TDG, where the TDG represents the faulty input IDS rule sets. This section of HWANG et al. does not disclose or suggest <u>representing business rules</u> using a transition-directed graph (TDG) representation, as recited in claim 2. Rather, this section of HWANG et al. discloses using a TDG to represent faulty rule sets. In fact, this section of HWANG et al. does not disclose business rules at all.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claims 9, 17, and 22 recite features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 9, 17, and 22 are patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 11, 12, and 14-16 depend from claim 9. Therefore, claims 11, 12, and 14-16 are patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 9. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by CHAN et al. and HWANG et al.

For example, claim 10 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 2. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

Claims 18-21 depend from claim 17. Therefore, claims 18-21 are patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 17. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by CHAN et al. and HWANG et al.

For example, claim 21 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 2. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

Claims 23-25, 27, and 28 depend from claim 22. Therefore, claims 23-25, 27, and 28 are patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 22. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by CHAN et al. and HWANG et al.

For example, claim 23 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 2. Therefore, claim 23 is patentable over CHAN et al. and HWANG et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on CHAN et al., HWANG et al, and BAHRAMI

Claims 5, 13, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over CHAN et al. in view of HWANG et al. and BAHRAMI. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4. Without acquiescing in the rejection of claim 5, Applicant submits that the disclosure of BAHRAMI does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of CHAN et al. and HWANG et al. set forth above with respect to claim 4. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over CHAN et al., HWANG et al., and BAHRAMI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12. Without acquiescing in the rejection of claim 13, Applicant submits that the disclosure of BAHRAMI does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of CHAN et al. and HWANG et al. set forth above with respect to

claim 12. Therefore, claim 13 is patentable over CHAN et al., HWANG et al., and BAHRAMI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25. Without acquiescing in the rejection of claim 26, Applicant submits that the disclosure of BAHRAMI does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of CHAN et al. and HWANG et al. set forth above with respect to claim 25. Therefore, claim 26 is patentable over CHAN et al., HWANG et al., and BAHRAMI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 25.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the proposed amendment because the proposed amendment places the application in better condition for allowance and appeal.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §

1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-1070 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /John E. Harrity, Reg. No. 43,367/
     John E. Harrity
     Reg. No. 43,367

Date: September 17, 2009

11350 Random Hill Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, VA 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 25537